

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
PART OF PATENTS
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/091,142	0:	3/05/2002	Jean-Pierre Blais		6661
7:	590	02/20/2004		EXAMINER	
Mr. Jean-Pier	re Blais	S	LAWRENCE JR, FRANK M		
1028 Carre Beausoleil				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
St-Jean Chrysostome, QC G6Z 1P9 CANADA				1724	

DATE MAILED: 02/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/091,142	BLAIS, JEAN-PIERRE	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Frank M. Lawrence	1724	
_ <u></u>		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 30 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued

condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706 07(f)	
706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (2) as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (3) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (3) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (3) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (3) as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(a) is ca	
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:	
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);	
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);	_
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the	e
(d) \(\sum_{they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.	
NOTE:	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	f
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	
Claim(s) allowed:	
Claim(s) objected to:	
Claim(s) rejected: 2	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(3)(175 Min) applied from Parallel Para	
Frank M. Lawrence Primary Examiner	

Art Unit: 1724

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the claim has not been amended in a way that distinguishes over the Le Brun patent, because the claim limitations are interpreted broadly as including a filter that can fit a rectangular or square duct, two shapes covered by "any shape." Also, it is submitted that the filter of Le Brun is inherently capable of fitting other duct shapes such as ciruclar or oval by bending the wire frame, as disclosed in the patent.

Continuation of 10. Other: the claim as amended would be rejected over Le Brun for reasons described above and in the previous office action.